

Serial No. 10/747,945

Docket No. HI-0177

Amdt. dated October 24, 2008

Reply to Office Action of July 3, 2008

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-12 and 20-25 are pending. Claims 26-29 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 6, 10, 20, 23, and 25 are amended, and claims 26-29 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Although Applicant disagrees with the Restriction Requirement and withdrawal of claims 26-29, to expedite prosecution of the application, claims 26-29 have been canceled to be pursued in a Continuation/Divisional application. No new matter is added. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Although Applicant disagrees with this rejection, to expedite prosecution of the application, claims 6 and 10 have been amended to delete the term "about." Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-2 and 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sasaki et al. (hereinafter "Sasaki"), U.S. Patent No. 5,267,085. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, a moving device comprising a single drive motor configured to reciprocatingly move the driving barrel to perform both focus

and zoom operations. Sakata does not disclose or suggest such feature, or the claimed combination of independent claim 1.

That is, Sasaki discloses a first holding frame 10 and a zooming motor  $M_z$  that moves the first holding frame 10 (see col. 5, lines 13-36, in particular col. 5, lines 34-36 of Sasaki), and a second holding frame 18 and a focusing motor  $M_z$  that moves the second holding frame 18 (see col. 5, line 59-col. 6, line 10, in particular, col. 6, lines 4-5 of Sasaki). However, Sasaki does not disclose or suggest a moving device comprising a single drive motor configured to reciprocatingly move the driving barrel to perform both focus and zoom operations.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 1 over Sasaki should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 2 and 4-9 are allowable over Sasaki at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claim 3 is allowable over Sasaki at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 3 over Sasaki should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Oda et al. (hereinafter "Oda"), U.S. Patent No. 6,850,631. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Serial No. **10/747,945**  
Amdt. dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of July 3, 2008

Docket No. **HI-0177**

Dependent claim 10 is allowable over Sasaki at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Oda fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sasaki, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching the specific claimed image pickup distance range. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 10 over Sasaki and Oda should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Ohkawara et al. (hereinafter "Ohkawara"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0135693. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claim 11 is allowable over Sasaki at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Ohkawara fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sasaki, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching wherein the position sensor comprises an optical sensor. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 11 over Sasaki and Ohkawara should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Bates et al. (hereinafter "Bates"), U.S. Patent No. 6,930,707. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claim 12 is allowable over Sasaki at least for the reason discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Bates fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sasaki, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching a lens

barrel used for an iris recognition camera in an iris recognition system. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 12 over Sasaki and Bates should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkawara in view of Bates. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 20 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, moving via a moving device comprising a single drive motor a camera lens of the iris recognition camera to an initial position detected by a position sensor after the position sensor detects the user, and thereafter reciprocatingly moving via the moving device comprising the single drive motor the camera lens to perform both focus and zoom operations from the initial position to an image pickup location where a user's iris can be captured. Ohkawara and Bates, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest such features, or the claimed combination of independent claim 20.

That is, Ohkawara discloses in Figs. 17-18 (referred to by the Examiner in his rejection) a focus-compensation lens driver 119 with a focus-compensation lens motor 120, as well as a variation lens driver 117 with a variation lens motor 118. However, Ohkawara does not disclose or suggest moving via a moving device comprising a single drive motor a camera lens of the iris recognition camera to an initial position detected by a position sensor after the position sensor detects the user, and thereafter reciprocatingly moving via the moving device comprising the single drive motor the camera lens to perform both focus and zoom operations from the initial position to an image pickup location where a user's iris can be captured. Bates fails to overcome

the deficiencies of Sasaki, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching a lens barrel used for an iris recognition camera in an iris recognition system.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 20 over Ohkawara and Bates should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 21-24 are allowable over Ohkawara and Bates at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 20, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkawara in view of Bates and further in view of Sasaki. The rejection is respectfully traversed

Dependent claim 25 is allowable over Ohkawara and Bates at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 20, from which they depend, as well as for their added features. Sasaki fails to overcome the deficiencies of Ohkawara and Bates, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching wherein the power transmission device includes a lead screw configured to be rotated by power from the drive motor, and rack screw-coupled to an outer circumference of lead screw. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 25 over Ohkawara, Bates, and Sasaki should be withdrawn.

Serial No. **10/747,945**

Docket No. **HI-0177**

Amdt. dated October 24, 2008

Reply to Office Action of July 3, 2008

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

Carol L. Druzick  
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3777 CLD:tlg

**Date: October 24, 2008**

\\Fk4\Documents\2019\2019-180\172497.doc

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**

Serial No. **10/747,945**

Docket No. **HI-0177**

Amdt. dated October 24, 2008

Reply to Office Action of July 3, 2008

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

  
Carol L. Drazbick  
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200

(703) 766-3777 CLD:tlg

**Date: October 24, 2008**

\\Fk4\Documents\2019\2019-180\172497.doc

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**